

July 20, 2006

**CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form**  
(Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/98)

1. Project Number(s)/Environmental Log Number/Title:

TPM 20675RPL<sup>1</sup>, Log No. 02-21-004; Dart Minor Subdivision

2. Lead agency name and address:

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use  
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B,  
San Diego, CA 92123-1666

3. a. Contact Gail Wright, Planner  
b. Phone number: (858) 694-3003  
c. E-mail: gail.wright@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Project location:

The project is located on the west side of Ribbonwood Road, between Roadrunner Lane and Interstate 8; in the community of Boulevard within the Mountain Empire Subregional Planning area in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County; APN 612-021-05.

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1300, Grid E/7

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Alfred H. Dart  
2374 Larkspur Drive  
Alpine, CA 91901

6. General Plan Designation  
Community Plan:  
Land Use Designation:

Mountain Empire  
(13) General Commercial; (18) Multiple  
Rural Use

Density: 1 du/4, 8 or 20 acre(s)

7. Zoning  
Use Regulation: C36 - General Commercial; S92 – General Rural Use  
Density: 0.125 du/8 acre(s)  
Special Area Regulation: none

8. Description of project (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation):

The project proposes a minor subdivision of a 33.46-acre parcel into three lots, resulting in two lots of 11.45 acres and one lot of 10.56 acres gross. The subject property is currently vacant; single-family residences are proposed for Parcels 1 and 2, and general commercial use is proposed for Parcel 3.

The site is subject to the General Plan Regional Category Rural Development Area (RDA), Land Use Designation (13) General Commercial (lot 3) and (18) Multiple Rural Use. Zoning for the site is C36 – General Commercial and S92 – General Rural. The site is currently vacant. Access would be provided by a driveways connecting to Ribbonwood Road.

The development will require grading for the building pads and driveways, with a cut and fill volume of 3,000 cubic yards. Each of the three lots will have an on-site sewage-disposal system and water supplies will be obtained by utilizing groundwater through proposed wells. Fire service is available to the project from the CSA #111 Boulevard Volunteer Fire and Rescue Department. The project includes the following off-site improvements: Ribbonwood Road and Roadrunner Road.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The project site is vacant, primarily flat, and contains native chaparral vegetation. Surrounding land uses include rural and residential uses. The property is just north of Interstate 8.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

**Permit Type/Action**

**Agency**

Tentative Parcel Map

County of San Diego

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:** The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Aesthetics</a>                      | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Agriculture Resources</a>              | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Air Quality</a>                       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Biological Resources</a> | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Cultural Resources</a>                 | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Geology &amp; Soils</a>               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Hazards &amp; Haz. Materials</a>    | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</a>      | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Land Use &amp; Planning</a>           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Mineral Resources</a>               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Noise</a>                   | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Population &amp; Housing</a>          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Public Services</a>                 | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Recreation</a>                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Transportation/Traffic</a> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Utilities &amp; Service Systems</a> | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Mandatory Findings of Significance</a> |  |

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

_____ Signature	_____ July 20, 2006 Date
_____ Gail Wright Printed Name	_____ Land Use/Environmental Planner Title

## **INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

**I. AESTHETICS** -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Scenic vistas are singular vantage points that offer unobstructed views of valued viewsheds, including areas designated as official scenic vistas along major highways or County designated visual resources. Based on a site visit completed by Mindy Fogg on July 24, 2002, the proposed project is not located near or visible from a scenic vista and will not change the composition of an existing scenic vista. The proposed project is less than two miles from Interstate 8 and State Route 94, Third Priority Scenic Routes. The project site will not have a visual impact due to the existing topography and natural vegetation. The site does not need to be subjected to scenic corridor protection measures since there will be no adverse visual effect. However, the project does include development standards through the design review process to ensure that adequate visual screening is provided. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated. A scenic highway is officially designated as a State scenic highway when the local jurisdiction adopts a scenic corridor protection program, applies to the California Department of Transportation for scenic highway approval, and receives notification from CalTrans that the highway has been designated as an official Scenic Highway. Based on a site visit completed by Mindy Fogg on July 24, 2002, the proposed project is located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway. Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The proposed project is less than two miles from Interstate 8 and State Route 94, Third Priority Scenic Routes. The project site will not have a visual impact due to the existing topography and natural vegetation. The site does not need to be subjected to scenic corridor protection

measures since there will be no adverse visual effect. However, the project does include development standards through the design review process to ensure that adequate visual screening is provided.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☒ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding can be characterized as flat, vacant land consisting of desert chaparral. The proposed project will not require significant alteration of the existing landform. The project site has an existing average slope of 6.59 percent gradient. Minor grading is proposed for three single-family dwelling units and the site has never been graded. The AEIS application states that .83 acres are to be graded with a volume of cut and fill at 3,000 cubic yards. Therefore, the resultant development will have no visual impact from landform modification or grading.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the entire existing viewshed and a list of past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the viewshed surrounding the project and will not contribute to a cumulative impact for the following reasons: The proposed project will not require significant alteration of the existing landform. The project site has an existing average slope of 6.59 percent gradient. Minor grading is proposed for three single-family dwelling units and the site has never been graded. The AEIS application states that .83 acres are to be graded with a volume of cut and fill at 3,000 cubic yards. Therefore, the resultant development will have no visual impact from landform modification or grading. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on visual character or quality on-site or in the surrounding area.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not propose any use of outdoor lighting or building materials with highly reflective properties such as highly reflective glass or high-gloss surface colors. Therefore, the project will not create any new sources of light pollution that could contribute to skyglow, light trespass or glare and adversely affect day or nighttime views in area. The proposed project will use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone A as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code,

**II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES** -- In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site does not contain any lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. In addition, the project does not contain Farmland of Local Importance. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Farmland of Local Importance will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site is zoned S92 (General Rural Use) and C36 (General Commercial), which is not considered to be an agricultural zone. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.

- c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site and surrounding area within radius of one mile do not contain any lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or Farmland of Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide, or Farmland of Local Importance will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

**III. AIR QUALITY** -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Operation of the project will not result in emissions of significant quantities of criteria pollutants listed in the California Ambient Air Quality Standards or toxic air contaminants as identified by the California Air Resources Board. Therefore, the project will not conflict or obstruct with the implementation of the RAQS nor the SIP on a project or cumulative level.

- b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?



- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) has established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. For CEQA purposes, these screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the CEQA Air Quality Handbook for the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which has stricter standards for emissions of ROCs/VOCs than San Diego's, is appropriate. However, the eastern portions of the county have atmospheric conditions that are characteristic of the Southeast Desert Air Basin (SEDAB). SEDAB is not classified as an extreme non-attainment area for ozone and therefore has a less restrictive screening-level. Projects located in the eastern portions of the County can use the SEDAB screening-level threshold for VOCs.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes to subdivide and construct three single family residences. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. In addition, the vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 36 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the Screening-Level Criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for criteria pollutants. As such, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM<sub>10</sub>) under the CAAQS. O<sub>3</sub> is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM<sub>10</sub> in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM<sub>10</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and VOCs from construction/grading activities, and VOCs as the result of increase of traffic from operations at the facility. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal and localized, resulting in PM<sub>10</sub> and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 36 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the Screening-Level Criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for VOCs and PM<sub>10</sub>.

In addition, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The proposed project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM<sub>10</sub>, or any O<sub>3</sub> precursors.

- d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12<sup>th</sup> Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality.

**No Impact:** Sensitive receptors have not been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project. Furthermore, no emissions of air pollutants are associated with the project. As such, the project will not expose sensitive populations to excessive levels of air pollutants.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified in association with the proposed project. As such, no impact from odors is anticipated.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated:** Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and a Biological Resources Survey Report (Vincent Scheidt, September 2004), the site contains 27.9 acres of semi-desert chaparral. The remaining 5.6 acres are urban/developed, associated with dirt roads

and clearing along the periphery of the property. Several County sensitive species were observed on site. Sensitive animals include the San Diego coast horned lizard, coastal western whiptail, and turkey vulture. Sensitive plants include the Jacumba milk-vetch (*Astragalus douglasii perstrictus*) and desert beauty (*Linanthus bellus*). No federal or state-listed species were observed or are expected to occur on site.

County staff has reviewed past, present, and probable future projects as listed in Section XVII(b), and has determined that development in the Boulevard area will have a cumulative impact on semi-desert chaparral habitat and sensitive plant species. However, this project's contribution to the cumulative loss will be less than cumulatively considerable upon implementation of the following mitigation measures: Prior to any habitat impacts, 13.95 acres of semi-desert chaparral on site will be preserved in a dedicated Open Space Easement. The Open Space Easement will preserve 100% of the observed locations of Jacumba milkvetch on-site and approximately 50% of the desert beauty. Both of these plant species occur in the southeastern portion of San Diego County. A large portion of land in this area is protected from future development through management by the Bureau of Land Management, Cleveland National Forest, and Anza Borrego State Park. Development of 13.95 acres of this site will slightly reduce the local population of desert beauty. However, preservation of 13.95 acres of this site that is known to support desert beauty will continue to contribute to the overall species distribution. Impacts to San Diego coast horned lizard, coastal western whiptail, and turkey vulture will be mitigated through the on-site preservation of semi-desert chaparral habitat. A Limited Building Zone Easement will be dedicated adjacent to the Open Space to limit construction within 100 feet of the Open Space easement, thereby preventing indirect impacts from fire clearing associated with the construction of future homes. Permanent signs and fences will be required along the Open Space boundary.

Therefore, staff has determined that although the site supports biological habitat, implementation of the mitigation measures described above will ensure that removal of this habitat will not result in substantial adverse effects, or have a cumulatively considerable impact to species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact  
☒ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

- ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated:** Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and a Biological Resources Survey Report (Vincent Scheidt, September 2004), the site contains 27.9 acres of semi-desert chaparral and 5.6 acres of urban/developed land. Semi-desert chaparral is a sensitive natural community within San Diego County.

As detailed in response a) above, direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to sensitive natural communities identified in the County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Natural Community Conservation Plan, Fish and Game Code, and Endangered Species Act are considered less than significant through the implementation of on-site Biological Open Space, a Limited Building Zone Easement, permanent fencing and permanent signage.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

- ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** County staff biologist Christine Stevenson has determined that the proposed project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, stream, lake, river or water of the U.S., that could potentially be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion or obstruction by the proposed development. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act in which the Army Corps of Engineers maintains jurisdiction over.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

- ☒ Less than Significant Impact  
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Due to surrounding residential development, the project site does not function as a wildlife corridor nor contribute to significant movement of native resident wildlife species. The site contains semi-desert chaparral, which may support nesting sites and breeding habitat for native wildlife. However, due to surrounding development and land uses, the site is unlikely to support any significant native wildlife nursery sites. On-site preservation of 13.95 acres of semi-desert chaparral will allow the continued use of the site for native wildlife breeding, and the permanent signs, permanent fencing, and a Limited Building Zone Easement will protect the habitat from future indirect impacts and edge effects. Therefore, with the on-site preservation of habitat, this project's contribution to any cumulative impacts to wildlife movement or native wildlife nursery sites will be rendered less than cumulatively considerable.

- e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☒ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated:** Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist November 23, 2004 for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP) Special Area Management Plans (SAMP) or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP).

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☒ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego qualified archaeologist, Brian F. Smith on September 11, 2002, it has been determined that there is one historical resource within

the project site. This resource includes an historic trash dump including items such as ceramic bottle/jar fragments, glass bottle/jar fragments, can fragments, ceramic crock/vessel fragments, glass jug fragments and ceramic tableware fragments. The total historic artifact recovery numbered 271. An historical resources report entitled, *Cultural Resources Survey and the Evaluation of Site SDI-16394H of the Al Dart Lot Split Boulevard, County of San Diego, California*, dated September 3, 2003, and prepared by Brian F. Smith of Brian F. Smith and Associates, evaluated the significance of the historical resources based on a site excavation consisting of five shovel test pits and one test unit. There was no evidence of structural remains on the property. Based on the results of this study, it has been determined that the historic resource is not significant pursuant to the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15064.5. Moreover, if the resources are not considered significant historic resources pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5 loss of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☒ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site has been surveyed by a County qualified archaeologist Brian F. Smith on September 11, 2002 and it has been determined that there is one historical archaeological resource present. This resource includes an historic trash dump including items such as ceramic bottle/jar fragments, glass bottle/jar fragments, can fragments, ceramic crock/vessel fragments, glass jug fragments and ceramic tableware fragments. The total historic artifact recovery numbered 271. An archaeological technical study titled, *Cultural Resources Survey and the Evaluation of Site SDI-16394H of the Al Dart Lot Split Boulevard, County of San Diego, California*, dated September 3, 2003, and prepared by Brian F. Smith of Brian F. Smith and Associates, evaluated the significance of the archaeological resources based on subsurface testing, analysis of recovered artifacts, and other investigations and has determined that the archaeological resource(s) are not significant pursuant to the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15064.5. Moreover, if the resources are not considered significant archaeological resources pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5 loss of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History indicates that the project is located on igneous rock and has no potential for producing fossil remains. Additionally, based on a site visit by Mindy Fogg On July 24, 2002, no known unique geologic features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity.

- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site has been surveyed by a County qualified archaeologist, Brian F. Smith, on September 11, 2002 and it has been determined that there is one historic archaeological resources present. This resource includes an historic trash dump including items such as ceramic bottle/jar fragments, glass bottle/jar fragments, can fragments, ceramic crock/vessel fragments, glass jug fragments and ceramic tableware fragments. The total historic artifact recovery numbered 271, An archaeological extended study entitled, *Cultural Resources Survey and the Evaluation of Site SDI-16394H of the Al Dart Lot Split Boulevard, County of San Diego, California*, dated September 3, 2003, and prepared by Brian F. Smith of Brian F. Smith and Associates, included subsurface excavations. No human remains were discovered during the course of these excavations. As outlined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, in the event that human remains are discovered during grading or construction of the project, the County will work with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 to ensure that all human remains will be appropriately treated or disposed of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any items associated with native American burials with the appropriate native Americans as identified by the NAHC.

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS** -- Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:



- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California. Also, a site visit conducted by Mindy Fogg on July 24, 2002 did not identify any features that would indicate landslides or the potential for liquefaction. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known hazard zone as a result of this project.

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Uniform Building Code (UBC) and the California Building Code (CBC) classifies all San Diego County with the highest seismic zone criteria, Zone 4. However, the project is not located within 5 kilometers of the centerline of a known active-fault zone as defined within the Uniform Building Code's Maps of Known Active Fault Near-Source Zones in California. In addition, the project will have to conform to the Seismic Requirements -- Chapter 16 Section 162- *Earthquake Design* as outlined within the California Building Code. Section 162 requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved by a County Structural Engineer before the issuance of a building or grading permit. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking as a result of this project.

- iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The geology of the project site is identified as Cretaceous Plutonic. This geologic environment is not susceptible to ground failure from seismic activity. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure.

iv. Landslides?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. Also, staff has determined that the geologic environment of the project area is not located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as La Posta loamy coarse sand that has a soil erodibility rating of "severe" as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes.
- The project involves grading. However, the project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for water and wind erosion.

Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil on a project level.

In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all the of past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); and County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

- c) Will the project produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project. On a site visit conducted by Mindy Fogg on July 24, 2002, no geological formations or features were noted that would produce unstable geological conditions as a result of the project. For further information refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., i-iv listed above.

- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not contain expansive soils as defined by Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). The soils on-site are La Posta loamy coarse sand. These soils have a shrink-swell behavior of low and represent no substantial risks to life or property.

Therefore, the project will not create a substantial risk to life or property. This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☒ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. The project involves the subdivision of land into three residential lots located in the community of Boulevard. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the OSWS lay-out for the project pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria." DEH approved the project's OSWS on March 15, 2002. Therefore, the project has soils capable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems as determined by the authorized, local public agency. In addition, the project will comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 6, Div. 8, Chap. 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits.

**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** -- Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporation

☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity.

- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

- ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project will not contain, handle, or store any potential sources of chemicals or compounds that would present a significant risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances.

- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

- ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

- d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

- ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project is not located on a site listed in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports; or within two miles of a public airport. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

- i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a framework document that provides direction to local jurisdictions to develop specific operational area of San Diego County. It provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY  
RESPONSE PLAN

**No Impact:** The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

**No Impact:** The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE  
RESPONSE PLAN

**No Impact:** The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

**No Impact:** The Dam Evacuation Plan will not be interfered with because the project is located outside a dam inundation zone.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☒ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Division 5, Chapter 3 and Appendix II-A of the Uniform Fire Code. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the Tentative Map, Tentative Parcel Map, or building permit process. Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter and conditions, dated May 17, 2006, have been received from the Boulevard Fire & Rescue Department. The conditions from the Boulevard Fire Protection District include: 100-foot limited building zone, a water tank on each parcel, fire sprinklers. A Fire Protection Plan, short form, was prepared by CDS Civil Engineers dated June 24, 2006 and reviewed by County Fire personnel. The report is a response to the Boulevard CSA Fire District requirements. Therefore, based on the review of the project by County staff, through compliance with the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Division 5, Chapter 3 and Appendix II-A of the Uniform Fire Code, and through compliance with the Boulevard Fire Protection District's conditions, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact, because all past, present and future projects in the surrounding area are required to comply with the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and the Uniform Fire Code.

- i) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, based on a site visit conducted by Mindy Fogg on July 22, 2002, there are none of these uses on adjacent properties. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

**VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** -- Would the project:

- a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?



- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

- ☒ Less than Significant Impact  
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes to subdivide a 33.49-acre parcel of vacant land into three residential lots, which requires a General Permit for Discharge of stormwater associated with construction activities. The project applicant has provided a copy of a Stormwater Management Plan for Minor Projects, which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the stormwater plan. The project site proposes and will be required to implement the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: silt fences, fiber rolls, sandbag barriers and any minor slopes created incidental to construction and not subject to a major or minor grading permit shall be protected by covering with plastic or tarp prior to a rain event, and shall have vegetative cover reestablished within 180 days or completion of the slope and prior to final building approval. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

Finally, the project's conformance to the waste discharge requirements listed above ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable water quality impacts related to waste discharge because, through the permit, the project will conform to Countywide watershed standards in the JURMP and SUSMP, derived from State regulation to address human health and water quality concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to water quality from waste discharges.

- b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

- ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project lies in the Colorado River region 7 and the area is not tributary to an impaired water body as listed According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, July 2003. Impaired water bodies in Region 7 are located in Imperial Valley approximately 40 miles to the east.

- c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

☒ Less than Significant Impact  
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: construction activities, driveway construction. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses: silt fences, fiber rolls, sandbag barriers and any minor slopes created incidental to construction and not subject to a major or minor grading permit shall be protected by covering with plastic or tarp prior to a rain event, and shall have vegetative cover reestablished within 180 days of completion of the slopes and prior to final building approval.

In addition, the proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water, storm water and groundwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. Refer to Section VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality, Question b, for more information on regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process.

- d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact  
☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

☒ Less than Significant Impact  
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes the use of groundwater for their water supply. The project was reviewed by County groundwater geologist and it was determined that groundwater was adequate to meet the demands of the project, and would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies in the area.

The project will not substantially interfere with groundwater recharge as the project propose to increase impervious surfaces of the site from zero to less than two percent of the project area.

- e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☒ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes to subdivide a 33.49-acre parcel of vacant land into three residential lots. As outlined in the Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) dated June 28, 2002 and prepared by James Bachofer, the project will implement the following site design measures, source control, and/or treatment control BMP's to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: silt fences, fiber rolls, sandbag barriers, and any minor slopes created incidental to construction and not subject to a major or minor grading permit shall be protected by covering with plastic or tarp prior to a rain event. These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements. The SWMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMPs that will address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any on-site and downstream drainage swales. The proposed project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. In addition a CEQA preliminary drainage report received 9-25-03 by DPLU was reviewed and accepted by DPW.

- f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems? In addition a CEQA preliminary drainage report received 9-25-03 by DPLU was reviewed and accepted by DPW.

- Drainage will be conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities.
- The project will not increase surface runoff exiting the project site equal to or greater than one cubic foot/second.

Therefore, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable alteration or a drainage pattern or increase in the rate or amount of runoff, because the project will substantially increase water surface elevation or runoff exiting the site, as detailed above.

- g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems? In addition a CEQA preliminary drainage report received September 25, 2003 by DPLU was reviewed and accepted by DPW.

- h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: construction activities. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in runoff to the maximum extent practicable: silt fences, fiber rolls, sandbag barriers, and any minor slopes created incidental to construction and not subject to a major or minor grading permit shall be protected by covering with plastic or tarp prior to a rain event. These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements. Refer to VIII Hydrology and Water Quality Questions a, b, c, for further information.

- i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site; therefore, no impact will occur. The project is not within any of the above areas, boundaries or maps. In addition a CEQA preliminary drainage report received September 25, 2003 by DPLU was reviewed and accepted by DPW.

- j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site ; therefore, no impact will occur. The project is not within the above area. In addition a CEQA preliminary drainage report received September 25, 2003 by DPLU was reviewed and accepted by DPW.

- k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project is not within the areas of any levees or dams. In addition a CEQA preliminary drainage report received September 25, 2003 by DPLU was reviewed and accepted by DPW.

- l) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

- i. SEICHE

**No Impact:** The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

- ii. TSUNAMI

**No Impact:** The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

- iii. MUDFLOW

**No Impact:** Mudflow is type of landslide. The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. It has determined that the geologic environment of the project area is not located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity. In addition, the project does propose land disturbance that will expose soils and the project is not located downstream from exposed soils within a landslide susceptibility zone. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING** -- Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not propose the introducing new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policies 1.4 (RDA) Rural Development Area and General Plan Land Use Designations (13) General Commercial and (18) Multiple Rural Use. The General Plan requires minimum gross parcel sizes of 4 acres. The proposed project has gross parcel sizes and density that are consistent with the General Plan. The project is subject to the policies of the Mountain Empire Subregional Community Plan. The proposed project is consistent with the policies of the Mountain Empire Subregional Community Plan. The current zone is S92 Use Regulation (Parcels 2 and 3), which require a net minimum lot size of 8 acres, and C36 (Parcel 1) General Commercial Use Regulation. The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements for minimum lot size.

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The lands within the project site do not have a Mineral Land Classification from the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997); but the site is located within an alluvial river valley that has a significant source of replenishment or is underlain by coastal marine/non-marine granular deposits. Moreover, if the resources are not considered significant mineral deposits, loss of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site is zoned C36 General Commercial and S92 General Rural Use, which is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S82) nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000). Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan will occur as a result of this project.

**XI. NOISE** -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated:** The project is a three-lot subdivision with two residential lots and one commercial lot. Parcels 1 and 2 and will be occupied by residences; Parcel 3 is a commercial lot, the use of which will not be determined until development. Based on a site visit completed by staff and as described in the Noise Analysis prepared by Eilar Associates dated October 30, 2003, the surrounding area supports a combination of rural residential, commercial and vacant lands. The project may expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego



Noise Ordinance; however, to mitigate the impact of noise to future residence of the proposed project from Interstate 8 and from Ribbonwood Road, staff requires a Noise Protection Easement over the entire area of Parcels 1,2 and 3. In addition, prior to final approval of any building permit, an acoustical analysis will be required by a County certified acoustical engineer, demonstrating that the present and anticipated future noise levels for the interior and exterior of the dwelling and commercial buildings will not exceed the allowable sound level limit of the Noise element of the San Diego County General Plan.

#### General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive area to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of CNEL 60 dB(A), modifications must be made to project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute. Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Eilar Associates dated October 30, 2003 project implementation may expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). However, to mitigate the impact of noise to future residence of the proposed project from Interstate 8 and from Ribbonwood Road, staff requires a Noise Protection Easement over the entire area of Parcels 1,2 and 3. In addition, prior to final approval of any building permit, an acoustical analysis will be required by a County certified acoustical engineer, demonstrating that the present and anticipated future noise levels for the interior and exterior of the dwelling and commercial buildings will not exceed the allowable sound level limit of the Noise element of the San Diego County General Plan.

#### Noise Ordinance – Section 36-404

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Eilar Associates dated October 30, 2003 non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404) at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned S92 that has a one-hour average sound limit of 50 dBA and C36 that has a one-hour average sound limit of 60 dBA. Most of the adjacent properties are zoned S92, with the exception of parcels to the west, across Ribbonwood Road are zoned C36, and have one-hour average sound limit of 50 dBA (for S92) and 60 dBA (C36). The Noise Analysis state's the project's noise levels at the adjoining properties will and will not exceed County Noise Standards.

#### Noise Ordinance – Section 36-410

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Eilar Associates dated October 30, 2003 the project will not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410). Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36-410. Also, It is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: temporary construction noises, and permanent noises associated with the addition of three residential homes. As indicated in the response listed under Section XI Noise, Question a., the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Acoustical Analysis Report by Eilar Associates

submitted September 25, 2003, for the Dart Tentative Parcel Map 20675. Studies completed by the Organization of Industry Standards (ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747) state an increase of 10 dB is perceived as twice as loud and is perceived as a significant increase in the ambient noise level.

The project will not result in cumulatively noise impacts because a list of past, present and future projects within in the vicinity were evaluated. It was determined that the project in combination with a list of past, present and future project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project does not involve any uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity including but not limited to extractive industry; outdoor commercial or industrial uses that involve crushing, cutting, drilling, grinding, or blasting of raw materials; truck depots, transfer stations or delivery areas; or outdoor sound systems.

Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410), which are derived from State regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36-410. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24-hour period. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

**XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING** -- Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes to subdivide an approximately 33-acre parcel into three residential lots. However, this physical **or** regulatory change will not induce substantial population growth in an area, because the project does not involve substantial extensions of utilities such as water, sewer or new roads systems into previously unserved areas and is consistent with the County General Plan.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project will not displace existing housing since the site is currently vacant. The addition of three dwelling units will yield a net gain of available housing.

- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people since the site is currently vacant.

**XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES**

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on the service availability forms received for the project, the proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate existing services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Boulevard Fire and Rescue Department and the Mountain Empire School District. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to

maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

#### **XIV. RECREATION**

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☒ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project involves a residential use of three additional homes that will increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To avoid substantial physical deterioration of local recreation facilities the project will be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks to the County pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO). The Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) is the mechanism that enables the funding or dedication of local parkland in the County. The PLDO establishes several methods by which developers may satisfy their park requirements. Options include the payment of park fees, the dedication of a public park, the provision of private recreational facilities, or a combination of these methods. PLDO funds must be used for the acquisition, planning, and development of local parkland and recreation facilities. Local parks are intended to serve the recreational needs of the communities in which they are located. Therefore, the project meets the requirements set forth by the PLDO for adequate parkland dedication and thereby reducing impacts, including cumulative impacts to local recreational facilities. The project will not result in significant cumulative impacts, because all past, present and future residential projects are required to comply with the requirements of PLDO. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

There is an existing surplus of County Regional Parks. Currently, there is over 21,765 acres of regional parkland owned by the County, which far exceeds the General Plan standard of 15 acres per 1,000 population. In addition, there are over one million acres of publicly owned land in San Diego County dedicated to parks or open space including Federal lands, State Parks, special districts, and regional river parks. Due to the extensive surplus of existing publicly owned lands that can be used for recreation the project will not result in substantial physical deterioration of regional recreational facilities or accelerate the deterioration of regional parkland. Moreover, the project will not result any cumulatively considerable deterioration or accelerated deterioration of regional recreation facilities because even with all past, present and future residential projects a significant surplus of regional recreational facilities will remain.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities cannot have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

**XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC** -- Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant:** The proposed project will result in an additional anticipated 400 ADT. The project was reviewed by DPW and was determined not to result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions for the following reasons: Currently there is approximately 250 ADT on Ribbonwood Road. The existing level of service on Ribbonwood Road is "A". The level of service with the project will be level of service "A". The increase of 400 ADT will not be a substantial increase.

A review by DPW of the project indicates that there will be no direct project impacts on traffic volume, which is considered substantial in relation to existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated:** The County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. This program includes the adoption of a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. Based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts, the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model was utilized to analyze projected build-out (year 2030) development conditions on the existing circulation element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Based on the results of the traffic modeling, funding necessary to construct transportation facilities that will mitigate cumulative impacts from new development was identified. Existing roadway deficiencies will be corrected through improvement projects funded by other public funding sources, such as TransNet, gas tax, and grants. Potential cumulative impacts to the region's freeways have been addressed in SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This plan, which considers freeway buildout over the next 30 years, will use funds from TransNet, state, and federal funding to improve freeways to projected level of service objectives in the RTP.

The proposed project generates an additional 400 ADT. These trips will be distributed on circulation element roadways in the County that were analyzed by the TIF program, some of which currently or are projected to operate at inadequate levels of service. These project trips therefore contribute to a potential significant cumulative impact and mitigation is required. The potential growth represented by this project was included in the growth projections upon which the TIF program is based. Therefore, payment of the TIF, which will be required at issuance of building permits, in combination with other components of the program described above, will mitigate potential cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |



Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Master Plan Zone and is not adjacent to any public or private airports; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant:** There are no significant impacts to traffic safety since adequate sight distance will be required looking in both directions along Ribbonwood Road from Roadrunner Lane and looking in both directions along Ribbonwood Road from the entrances for Parcels 2 and 3. The proposed project will not significantly alter traffic safety on Ribbonwood Road. All road improvements will be constructed according to the County of San Diego Public and Private Road Standards. Roads used to access the proposed project site are up to County standards. The proposed project will not place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant:** The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The Boulevard Fire and Rescue Department has reviewed the proposed project and associated emergency access roadways and has determined that there is adequate emergency fire access proposed. Additionally, roads used will be required to be improved to County standards.

- f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Zoning Ordinance Section 6758 Parking Schedule requires two on-site parking spaces for each dwelling unit. The proposed lots have sufficient area to provide at least two on-site parking spaces consistent with the Zoning Ordinance.

- g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant:** The project does not propose any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists. Any required improvements will be constructed to maintain existing conditions as it relates to pedestrians and bicyclists.

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** -- Would the project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. The project involves the creation of three residential lots with three standard subsurface on-site wastewater systems (OSWS) located in the vicinity of each residence. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the OSWS lay-out for the project pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria." DEH approved the project's OSWS on

March 15, 2002. Therefore, the project is consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB as determined by the authorized, local public agency.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project will not be constructing new stormwater drainage facilities or expanding existing facilities.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** As identified within Section 67.722B of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance, it has been determined that groundwater resources are adequate to meet the groundwater demands of the project and thus, the project will not adversely impact groundwater availability.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project will rely completely on an on-site wastewater system (septic system); therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☒ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

☐ No Impact

**Discussion/Explanation:**

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. Resources that have been evaluated as significant would be potentially impacted by the project: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and a Biological Resources Survey Report (Vincent Scheidt, September 2004), the site contains 27.9 acres of semi-desert chaparral. The remaining 5.6 acres are urban/developed, associated with dirt roads and clearing along the periphery of the property. Several County sensitive species were observed on-site. Sensitive animals include the San Diego coast horned lizard, coastal western whiptail, and turkey vulture. Sensitive plants include the Jacumba milk-vetch (*Astragalus douglasii perstrictus*) and desert beauty (*Linanthus bellus*). No federal or state-listed species were observed or are expected to occur on-site. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to sensitive natural communities identified in the County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Natural Community Conservation Plan,

Fish and Game Code, and Endangered Species Act are considered less than significant through the implementation of on-site Biological Open Space, a Limited Building Zone Easement, permanent fencing and permanent signage. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, significant effects associated with this project would result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☒ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**FOR ALL RESPONSES**

The following list of past, present and future projects were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT/MAP NUMBER
Dart Tentative Parcel Map (Current project)	TPM 20675
Smith Tentative Parcel Map	TPM 20580
Erdman Tentative Parcel Map	TPM 20698

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these cumulative effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes payment of the Traffic Impact Fee (TIF). As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact  
☒ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporated

- ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated:** In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, VIII Hydrology and Water Quality XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects to human beings related to the following: Noise impact from Interstate 8 and Ribbonwood Road and Traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes the placement of a noise easement over the entire area of Parcels 1, 2 and 3; in addition the payment by the applicant of a Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) will mitigate the impacts of cumulative traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are adverse effects to human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

## **XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation refer to [www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov). For County regulation refer to [www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com). All other references are available upon request.

### **AESTHETICS**

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283.  
(<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/>)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283.  
(<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910.  
([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances.  
([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996).  
(<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000 (<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997. ([www.intl-light.com](http://www.intl-light.com))

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPPI), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003. ([www.lrc.rpi.edu](http://www.lrc.rpi.edu))

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA. (<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System. ([www.blm.gov](http://www.blm.gov))

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legisregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

#### AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965. ([www.ceres.ca.gov](http://www.ceres.ca.gov), [www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996. ([www.qp.gov.bc.ca](http://www.qp.gov.bc.ca))

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System. ([www.nrcs.usda.gov](http://www.nrcs.usda.gov), [www.swcs.org](http://www.swcs.org))

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. ([soils.usda.gov](http://soils.usda.gov))

#### AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. ([www.aqmd.gov](http://www.aqmd.gov))

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

#### BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. ([www.dfg.ca.gov](http://www.dfg.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5<sup>th</sup> Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. ([www.ceres.ca.gov](http://www.ceres.ca.gov))

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987. (<http://www.wes.army.mil>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. ([www.epa.gov](http://www.epa.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. ([endangered.fws.gov](http://endangered.fws.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. ([endangered.fws.gov](http://endangered.fws.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. ([ecos.fws.gov](http://ecos.fws.gov))



U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002.  
([migratorybirds.fws.gov](http://migratorybirds.fws.gov))

Scheidt, Vincent N., Biological Resources Survey Report for the Dart Tentative Parcel Map Project, TPM 20675, September 2004

#### CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

*Cultural Resources Survey and the Evaluation of Site SDI-16394H of the Al Dart Lot Split Boulevard, County of San Diego, California*, dated September 3, 2003, and prepared by Brian F. Smith of Brian F. Smith and Associates

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

#### GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. ([soils.usda.gov](http://soils.usda.gov))

#### HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. ([www.dtsc.ca.gov](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health  
Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and  
Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March  
2003. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health,  
Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental  
Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines.  
(<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/>, [www.oes.ca.gov](http://www.oes.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health,  
Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials  
Business Plan Guidelines. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title  
3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban  
Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000.  
([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency  
Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code,  
Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq.  
([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization  
Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization  
Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June  
1995.

Uniform Building Code. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western  
Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference  
of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection  
Association Standards 13 & 13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R,  
1996 Edition. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

## HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service  
Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A  
Handbook for Local Government

California Department of Water Resources, California Water  
Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources  
State of California. 1998. ([rubicon.water.ca.gov](http://rubicon.water.ca.gov))

California Department of Water Resources, California's  
Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003.  
([www.groundwater.water.ca.gov](http://www.groundwater.water.ca.gov))

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No.  
8, August 2000. ([www.dpla2.water.ca.gov](http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov))

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, §  
8680-8692. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES  
General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL  
ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction  
Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm  
Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000  
et seq. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board,  
Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan.  
([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division  
7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and  
Watercourses. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994.  
([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov), <http://www.amlegal.com/>.)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan,  
2002. ([www.projectcleanwater.org](http://www.projectcleanwater.org))

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water  
Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance,  
Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7,  
Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory  
Ordinances and amendments. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68.  
Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined  
Floodways. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972,  
Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-  
Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United  
States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220,  
1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. ([www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov))

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994.  
([www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov))

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water  
Code Division 7. Water Quality. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality  
Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997.  
([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES  
Permit No. CAS0108758. ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water  
Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin.  
([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

## LAND USE & PLANNING

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and  
Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land  
Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San  
Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996.  
([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines,  
2003. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources  
Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations,  
Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title  
14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001.  
([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51,  
California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and  
Procedures, January 2000. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title  
8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84:  
Project Facility. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989.  
([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord. Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books, 1999. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

#### MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

#### NOISE

Acoustical Analysis Report by Eilar Associates submitted September 25, 2003, for the Dart Tentative Parcel Map 20675.

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. . ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. ([www.iso.ch](http://www.iso.ch))

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

#### POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

#### RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

#### TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. ([www.dot.ca.gov](http://www.dot.ca.gov))

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994). ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. ([www.gpoaccess.gov](http://www.gpoaccess.gov))

#### UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. ([ccr.oal.ca.gov](http://ccr.oal.ca.gov))

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation  
Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace,  
Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management  
(BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway  
Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for  
Highway Projects.

ND07-06\0221004-ISF:jcr